

## **Legislatively Required Standards Review Process in Other States:**

### **Indiana (2013)**

State revoked adoption of Common Core in 2013, and initiated a standards revision process. The state education agency was charged with rewriting the standards. Agency staff referred both to Indiana's previous standards and the Common Core for guidance. They produced two draft iterations that were both available online for public comment and for which they sought external independent reviews. They received approximately 2,000 public comments; external reviews were sought from:

- The Fordham Institute: Indiana team self reported that they found this review unhelpful in their revision efforts.
- Terrence Moore (anti-CCSS advocate): unserious effort, with no recognition of actual learning needs of students.
- Sandra Stotsky (ELA standards writer, anti-CCSS advocate): refused to provide feedback, demagogued process.
- James Milgram (Math standards writer, anti-CCSS advocate): provided thoughtful feedback, IN standards writers determined not to incorporate recommendations.
- Achieve: provided actionable recommendations for incorporation into final draft on both ELA and math standards

Final draft approved for use in 2014-15 school year. Aftermath of process is that Governor Pence and legislature have peace of mind that they conducted an Indiana-specific process. Nevertheless, there continues to be Tea Party sniping that the Indiana standards "contain too much Common Core," the threat of more legislation and the state education agency estimates that the revision, retraining of teachers and development of new Indiana-specific assessments has a fiscal impact of \$65 million.

### **Missouri (2014)**

Legislation passed in 2014 calls for the establishment of a standards revision process, leaving the CCSS in place during the review. Working groups in both mathematics and ELA were seated last week. Working groups consist of Missouri educators, higher education representatives, employers, content experts and state education agency officials. So far, process has proven unwieldy with multiple working groups each consisting of over a dozen members, and without requisite funding or guidance to conduct work.

### **Oklahoma (2014)**

Legislation passed in 2014 revoked the Common Core immediately, reverting to Oklahoma's 2007 standards until new standards could be developed for the 2016-17 school year. Parents, teachers and State Board of Education members subsequently, unsuccessfully sued the state to reverse the legislation; Oklahoma lost

## North Carolina Academic Standards Review Commission

its NCLB waiver for not being able to demonstrate that its 2007 standards met US ED requirements that they are college and career ready (Oklahoma higher education system would not certify the 2007 standards); have a number of local school districts that are continuing with implementation of the Common Core; and do not have a state assessment in place for 2014-15 school year (CTB/McGraw Hill withdrew from contract and no new vendors have expressed interest in delivering assessment.)

### **South Carolina (2014)**

Legislation passed in 2014 calls for the establishment of a standards revision process leaving the CCSS in place during the review. Process will be led out of state education agency, actual work still to be determined.

### **Other State Review Processes:**

#### **Kentucky (2014)**

In 2014, the state education agency in partnership with community-based organizations launches **Kentucky Core Academic Standards Challenge**. The effort seeks to increase awareness and understanding of the Kentucky Core Academic Standards in English/language arts and mathematics and to solicit actionable feedback, with evidence, on the standards as part of the Kentucky Department of Education's regular review process of academic standards. The process is web-based (<http://kentucky.statestandards.org>) and open to all to provide feedback, results will be released in April 2015, and vetted by Kentucky educators to provide recommendations to the State Board of Education.